



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,282	01/18/2000	Sergey A. Selifonov	02-028930US	3228

22798 7590 11/20/2001

LAW OFFICES OF JONATHAN ALAN QUINE  
P O BOX 458  
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

EXAMINER

ZHOU, SHUBO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/494,282

Applicant(s)

SELIFONOV ET AL.

Examiner

Shubo "Joe" Zhou

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15,20,21 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration in Paper #19, filed on 9/19/01, is acknowledged and the amendments entered.

Applicant's arguments in response to the previous Office Action, mailed 3/9/01/01, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be fully persuasive. Rejections and/or objections from previous Office actions not reiterated herein are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated from the previous Office actions, or newly applied, and constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 43-53 are currently pending and under examination.

#### ***Specification***

The specification is objected to because of the following:

The disclosure is objected to because it contains embedded hyperlinks and/or other form or browser-executable codes. Such code is present in the specification at page 49 and elsewhere. Applicants are required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP ' 608.01. This rejection is reiterated from the previous Office action and maintained for reasons of record. While applicants amended to delete some of the codes, such code is still present in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections-35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

**The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.**

Claims 43-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 , second paragraph, as being vague, indefinite and confusing for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase “a plurality of single-stranded oligonucleotide or peptide subsequences of the parental character string or a complement thereof” in step b) of claim 43 and in the claims depending from claim 43, is vague and confusing. It is not clear of what “a complement” is. Is it of the single stranded oligonucleotide subsequences, of the parental string, or of the peptide subsequences? If of the peptide subsequences, what is the definition of such complement? It is noted that the term “peptide” was added into the claim by amendment.

***Claim Rejections-35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

**(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.**

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 43-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao et al. (IDS document: Nature Biotechnology, Vol. 16:258-261, March, 1998).

This rejection is reiterated from the previous Office action and maintained for reasons of record.

Applicants argue that the instant claims are amended to be methods of recombining character strings, i.e. representations of polynucleotides or polypeptides while Zhao et al. is directed towards the recombination of nucleic acids *per se*. This "representation" was brought up by applicants during the interview conducted on 8/8/01 and the Examiner agreed to reconsider the claims once so amended. Applicants' argument is not deemed persuasive. It is well-known that nucleic acids and polypeptides are represented by letters or characters, for example, A, T, G and C for nucleotides. Since Zhao et al. conducted the actual recombination of nucleic acids and since such nucleic acids are represented by letters like A, T, G and C, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art that such recombination can be represented by recombination of character strings, i.e. strings of A, T, G, and/or C.

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1631

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703)305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to:

Shubo "Joe" Zhou, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 605-1158. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Patent Analyst Tina Plunkett whose telephone number is (703)-305-3524, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

  
S. "Joe" Zhou, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner

**MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

